

II. REMARKS

Preliminary Remarks

Claims 1, 4-9, and 16-25 are pending and remain as previously presented. The applicants respectfully request re-consideration of the present invention in view of the remarks and arguments set forth below.

Patentability Remarks

35 U.S.C. §103(a)

A. Claims 1, 4, 5, 7, 16, 18, 21, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable in view of Felberbaum et al. (1997) or Albano et al. (1996) or Engel et al. (1997) or Olivennes et al. (1994), considered in combination with Ziegler et al. (1998), and further in view of Hall et al. (1991).

The claims relate to controlled ovarian stimulation (COS) to program a menstrual cycle. Claim 1 further defines two menstrual cycles, “the programmed menstrual cycle,” and “the preceding menstrual cycle.” Claim 1 recites administration of an LHRH antagonist during the luteal phase of “the preceding menstrual cycle” and an administration of an LHRH antagonist during the follicular phase of “the programmed menstrual cycle.” The examiner cites art relating to a luteal phase administration of an LHRH antagonist. The cited art relates to a single menstrual cycle and does not disclose the claimed two-cycle administration. The present invention is distinguished because it establishes the principle of a two-cycle administrative procedure. The present invention establishes that more than merely administering various compounds is required, but their administration is advantageously not limited to a single cycle. Rather, the chemical history of a first cycle influences and controls the physiology of a subsequent cycle.

The Applicants further re-allege their previousl presented arguments. The four alternative primary references (Felberbaum et al., Albano et al., Engel et al., and Olivennes et al.) describe protocols based on known and commonly applied procedures for carrying out ovarian

stimulation (OS) and assisted reproductive techniques (ART) in normal physiologic menstrual cycles. Felberbaum et al., Albano et al., Engel et al., and Olivennes et al. each describes a normal controlled ovarian stimulation (COS) procedure in which HMG is administered starting on day 2 of the treatment cycle for ovarian stimulation, and an LHRH antagonist is administered starting on day 4 or 5 of the cycle to prevent premature ovulation, HCG is administered when a sufficient number of follicles of sufficient diameter was observed, and oocytes are recovered and used in the application of ART.

The cited primary references do not describe or suggest a method for therapeutic management of infertility and increasing the quality of fertilized oocytes and embryos by programming COS and ART, which method comprises programming the start of a treatment cycle comprising COS by inducing the start of menses by administering a LHRH antagonist selected from the group consisting of cetrorelix, teverelix, ganirelix, antide, and abarelix during the luteal phase of the menstrual cycle preceding the treatment cycle, as specified in claim 1.

The examiner cites Ziegler et al. as teaching the desirability of timing the onset of controlled ovarian hyperstimulation (COH), and alleges that at the time the invention was made it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify a method for COS and ART as described by Felberbaum et al., Albano et al., Engel et al., or Olivennes et al., “by providing advanced timing via administration of a composition to allow for improved scheduling of treatments,” with “the expectation of improving the efficiency of treatment scheduling and thus fertilization success with the advanced timing method.” *See* pages 10-11 of the official action.

The examiner cites Hall et al. for its teaching that administering three daily doses of the LHRH antagonist Nal-Glu during the mid-luteal phase caused “dramatic” decreases in blood concentrations of estrogen and progestogen, and induced luteolysis and the onset of menstrual bleeding within 24-48 hours after the final day of LHRH antagonist administration in all subjects. *See* page 997, bottom of left column. The examiner observes that the LHRH antagonist was administered with a dosage of 150 µg/kg, and alleges that it would have been obvious to vary or optimize the amount of LHRH antagonist administered during the luteal phase as the determination of optimum or workable ranges is routine experimentation. The examiner

alleges that it would have been obvious to combine the methods of the primary references with that of Ziegler et al., to obtain a method of programming the timing of COS/ART in which an estrogen-only preparation is administered during the cycle preceding COS/ART that comprises administering an LHRH antagonist during the follicular phase, and then to further modify said method to administer an LHRH antagonist during the preceding cycle to induce the timed onset of menstrual bleeding prior to the start of COS/ART procedures, in view of the teachings of Hall et al. regarding LHRH antagonists. *See* page 13 of the official action. While Hall et al. does not disclose administering an LHRH antagonist specified in claim 1 (*i.e.*, cetrorelix, teverelix, ganirelix, antide, or abarelix), the examiner alleges that it would have been obvious to do so since these are disclosed in the primary references. *See* pages 11-13 of the official action.

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, the examiner must show that the prior art references themselves or the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art would (1) provide some suggestion or motivation to modify or combine reference teachings to obtain the claimed invention, (2) teach or suggest all of the claim limitations, and (3) provide a reasonable expectation that the claimed invention can be made or used successfully. *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991). *See* M.P.E.P. § 2142.

In determining if there is obviousness in the first instance, "it is necessary to ascertain whether or not the reference teachings would appear to be sufficient for one of ordinary skill in the relevant art having the reference before him to make the proposed substitution, combination, or other modification." *In re Linter*, 458 F.2d 1013, 1016, 173 USPQ 560, 562 (CCPA 1972). Obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988); *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). *See* M.P.E.P. § 2142.

The prior art can be modified or combined to reject claims as *prima facie* obvious as long as there is a reasonable expectation of success. *In re Merck & Co., Inc.*, 800

F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). Obviousness does not require absolute predictability, however, at least some degree of predictability is required. *In re Rinehart*, 531 F.2d 1048, 189 USPQ 143 (CCPA 1976). The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, and not based on applicant's disclosure." *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991). Combining prior art references without evidence of a suggestion, teaching, or motivation "simply takes the inventor's disclosure as a blueprint for piecing together the prior art to defeat patentability--the essence of hindsight." See Ecolchem, Inc. v. Southern California Edison Co., 227 F.3d 1361, 1371-72; 56 U.S.P.Q.2d 1065 (C.A.Fed. - Cal., 2000).

The applicants respectfully submit that the examiner has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness, because the cited references would not have provided one of ordinary skill in the art with a suggestion or motivation to modify a normal method for COS and ART such as a protocol described by Felberbaum et al., Albano et al., Engel et al., or Olivennes et al., by administering a LHRH antagonist selected from the group consisting of cetrorelix, teverelix, ganirelix, antide, and abarelix during the luteal phase of the menstrual cycle preceding the treatment cycle, in order to program the start of a treatment cycle comprising COS by inducing the start of menses, in accord with the claimed invention. Furthermore, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would not reasonably have expected that a method for COS and ART that is modified by administering a LHRH antagonist during the luteal phase of the menstrual cycle preceding the treatment cycle in order to induce luteolysis and the start of menses as described by Hall et al. would operate successfully, due to deleterious or disruptive effects of gonadotropin deprivation caused by the LHRH antagonist on the physiological and biochemical processes required for oocyte development, as discussed below.

No suggestion or motivation to modify or combine the cited references

As discussed above, the four primary references, Felberbaum et al., Albano et al., Engel et al., and Olivennes et al., describe protocols for COS and ART comprising administering HMG starting on day 2 of the treatment cycle for ovarian stimulation, administering an LHRH antagonist during the follicular phase of the cycle to prevent premature ovulation, administering

HCG to induce ovulation, recovering oocytes and applying ART. None of the primary references describe or suggest performing the claimed method of COS and ART comprising programming the start of the treatment cycle by inducing the start of menses by administering a LHRH antagonist during the luteal phase of the menstrual cycle preceding the treatment cycle.

Ziegler et al. describe a method for “timing assisted reproductive techniques (intrauterine insemination and in-vitro fertilization) in the natural cycle” that comprises administering estradiol starting about 7 days before the onset of menses and continuing for about 5 days, until the first Tuesday following the onset of menses, defined as functional day (FD) 0; starting daily administration of HMG on FD3 (Friday) that is continued for about 11 days, on average, of HMG treatment; and then administering HCG to induce ovulation. The method of Ziegler et al. delays the intercycle elevation of FSH but does not affect the timing of the onset of menstrual bleeding, which is described as being regulated by progesterone (*see* page 562, right column). Ziegler et al. expressly describe their method as one that permits an advanced timing of the onset of controlled ovarian hyperstimulation (COH) treatments “when gonadotrophin-releasing hormone (GnRH) agonists are not used,” and as having practical applications for timing ART “in the natural cycle.” *See* page 561, left column. Thus, Ziegler et al. expressly teaches away from modifying a normal COS/ART procedure that include administering an LHRH antagonist during the follicular phase to suppress premature ovulation so as to obtain a method that comprises administering a LHRH antagonist during the preceding cycle to induce the timed onset of menstrual bleeding.

The examiner alleges that it would have been obvious to combine the methods of the primary references with that of Ziegler et al., in view of Hall et al. to obtain a method of programming the timing of COS/ART in which an LHRH antagonist is administered during the preceding cycle to induce the timed onset of menstrual bleeding prior to the start of COS/ART procedures, “with the expectation of providing control of menstrual phases to provide advanced timing” for ART (*see* page 13 of the official action). However, contrary to the examiner’s allegation, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would not reasonably have expected that a method for COS and ART that is modified by administering a LHRH antagonist during the luteal phase of the menstrual cycle preceding the treatment cycle in order to induce the start of menses would operate successfully for carrying out controlled ovarian

stimulation (COS) and assisted reproductive techniques (ART). Scientific articles published at the time the invention was made would have led one of ordinary skill in the art to expect that administration of an amount of LHRH antagonist during the luteal phase sufficient to induce luteolysis and the start of menses could have deleterious effects on oocyte meiosis and the mitotic programs of cells undergoing folliculogenesis, blastomere formation and endometrium development, during the following cycle. LHRH antagonists were considered to have potentially deleterious effects mediated by mechanisms separate from their effects on gonadotropin levels. For example, LHRH antagonists were considered to be capable of compromising the mitotic program of cells undergoing folliculogenesis, blastomere formation and endometrium development by inhibiting the synthesis of growth factors and through direct interactions with the LHRH receptor (*e.g.*, *see* the abstract of Hernandez, 2000, Human Reproduction 15(6):1211-1216). LHRH antagonists were also considered to be capable of interfering with mechanisms involved in germinal vesicle breakdown and the cell signaling pathway driving the oocyte into metaphase II (*e.g.*, *see* De la Fuente et al, 1999, Human Reproduction, 14: 3060-3068). Hall et al. reported that the cycle following induction of luteolysis by an LHRH antagonist was lengthened by about 6 days, and stated that further study is needed to determine if this difference is the result of altered gonadotropin dynamics after administration of the antagonist and possible effects of these on the developing follicle” (*see* page 999, middle of left column). Accordingly, prior to the successful demonstration of the efficacy of the claimed invention by the present applicants, it was not known if the timing of successful COS/ART procedures could be effectively programmed by administering a dosage of an LHRH antagonist during the luteal phase of the preceding cycle that induces the start of menses. Rather than having a deleterious effect upon the developing oocyte and supportive tissues, the claimed method provides for successful programming of COS/ART procedures with the surprising advantage that follicular development is coordinated so that an increased number of high quality, mature follicles of similar size is produced for ART, as described in the Declaration of Dr. Riethmüller-Winzen that was submitted with the previous response.

In view of the foregoing, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 4, 5, 7, 16, 18, and 21-25 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as having been obvious in view of Felberbaum et al. or Albano et al.

or Engel et al. or Olivennes et al., in combination with Ziegler et al. (1998), and further in view of Hall et al., is respectfully requested.

B. Claims 22-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable in view of (i) Felberbaum et al. (1997) or Albano et al. (1996) or Engel et al. (1997) or Olivennes et al. (1994), considered in combination with (ii) Ziegler et al. (1998), and further in view of Hall et al. (1991).

The examiner alleges the art to disclose the administration of various compounds and in various amounts. The Applicants respectfully submit that the cited art lacks a teaching of the present invention. As discussed above, the present invention claims not merely an administration of various amounts of various compounds during a menstrual cycle. Rather, what is claimed is the use of a first cycle to time and prime a second cycle. This teaching is missing from the cited art.

The Applicants respectfully re-allege their prior-presented arguments. The teachings of Felberbaum et al., Albano et al., Engel et al., Olivennes et al., Ziegler et al., and Hall et al., as applied by the examiner are discussed above.

As discussed above, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would not have been motivated to combine the methods of the primary references with that of Ziegler et al., in view of Hall et al., to obtain a method of programming the timing of COS/ART in which a LHRH antagonist, is administered during the preceding cycle to induce the timed onset of menstrual bleeding prior to the start of COS/ART procedures, and would reasonably have expected that such a method would be associated with deleterious effects that would prevent successful operation of the COS/ART procedures, as discussed above. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 6, 8, 9, 17, 19, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as having been obvious in view of Felberbaum et al. or Albano et al. or Engel et al. or Olivennes et al., in combination with Ziegler et al. taken with Hall et al., is respectfully requested.

C. Claims 6, 8, 9, 17, 19, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable in view of (i) Felberbaum et al. (1997) or Albano et al. (1996) or Engel et al. (1997) or Olivennes et al. (1994), considered in combination with (ii) Ziegler et al. (1998), and further in combination

with (iii) Hall et al. (1991), and further in view of Deghengi (U.S. Patent No. 5,945,128) or Rabasseda (1999).

The inadequacy of Felberbaum et al. (1997), Albano et al. (1996), Engel et al. (1997), Olivennes et al. (1994), Ziegler et al. (1998), and Hall have been discussed above. None of these references relates to two-cycle administration of hormones to trigger and time a menstrual cycle. Deghengi is described by the examiner as teaching that cetrorelix, teverelix, ganirelix, and antide were known to be the LHRH antagonists. Rabasseda is described by the examiner as teaching that LHRH antagonists such as cetrorelix, ganirelix, and abarelix were known to be useful for treating female infertility. However, none of these teachings relates to the missing teaching.

Judicially Created Doctrine of Obviousness Double Patenting

Claims 1 and 4-9, 16-21, and 25 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-6 of U.S. Patent No. 6,319,192 of Engel et al., in view of Ziegler et al., Hall et al., Deghengi, Rabasseda, and Kent, as applied above. As claims 10-15 are canceled, the statement of the rejection is addressed as it applies to pending claims 1, 4-9, and 16-25.

The applicants submit that at the time the invention was filed, one of ordinary skill in the art would not have been motivated to combine the method of claims 1-6 of U.S. Patent No. 6,319,192 with that of Ziegler et al., in view of Hall et al., Deghengi, Rabasseda, and Kent, to obtain a method of programming the timing of COS/ART in which a LHRH antagonist is administered during the preceding cycle to induce the timed onset of menstrual bleeding prior to the start of COS/ART procedures, with a reasonable expectation of success. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was filed could not reasonably have predicted the effects of administering a LHRH antagonist during the preceding cycle to induce the timed onset of menstrual bleeding prior to the start of COS/ART procedures, and would reasonably have expected such a step to cause deleterious effects that would prevent successful operation of the COS/ART procedures, as discussed above. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 4-9, and 16-25 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-6 of U.S. Patent No. 6,319,192 of Engel et al., in view of

Ziegler et al., Hall et al., Deghengi, Rabasseda, and Kent, as applied above, is respectfully requested.

III. CONCLUSION

All rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited. If the examiner identifies any points that he feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, he is kindly requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Please charge any fees or credit any overpayments associated with the submission of this response to Deposit Account Number 03-3975.

Respectfully submitted,

PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN LLP

Date: May 12, 2009

By /John A Evans/

John A. Evans, Ph.D.

Reg. No. 44,900

Tel. No. 202.663.8096

Fax No. 703.770.7901

PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN LLP
P.O. Box 10500
McLean, VA 22102
703.770.7900